arXiv:1212.5591v2 [math.CA] 10 Jan 2013

CORDES-NIRENBERG TYPE ESTIMATES FOR NONLOCAL PARABOLIC EQUATIONS

YONG-CHEOL KIM AND KI-AHM LEE

Abstract. In this paper, we obtain Cordes-Nirenberg type estimates for nonlocal parabolic equations on the more flexible solution space $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ than the classical solution space $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$ consisting of all bounded functions on $\mathbb{R}^n_T$.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
1.1. Nonlocal parabolic equations. 1
1.2. Outline 2
1.3. Notations 3
2. Preliminaries 3
3. Boundary estimates and Global estimates 6
4. Some results by approximation 8
5. $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity for nonlocal parabolic equations with variable coefficients 14
6. Cordes-Nirenberg type estimates and Applications 17
References 22

1. Introduction

1.1. **Nonlocal parabolic equations.** In this paper, we study Cordes-Nirenberg type estimates on the more flexible solution space $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ for nonlocal parabolic integro-differential equations. In [KL], we obtained interior $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates on the solution space $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$ for nonlocal parabolic translation-invariant equations, and also the reader can refer to [CS1] and [CS2] for the elliptic case.

Throughout this paper, we consider the purely nonlocal parabolic Isaacs equations of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}u(x,t)-\partial_t u(x,t)&:=\inf_{a\in A}\sup_{b\in B}\left(L_{ab}u(x,t)-\partial_t u(x,t)\right)\\ &=\inf_{a\in A}\sup_{b\in B}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu_t(u,x,y)(2-\sigma)\frac{c_{ab}(x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy-\partial_t u(x,t)\right)\\ &=f(x,t)\quad\text{in } \Omega\times(-\tau,0]:=\Omega_\tau,\ 0<\tau\le T,\end{aligned}\tag{1.1}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\mu_t(u,x,y)=u(x+y,t)+u(x-y,t)-2u(x,t)$ and $\{c_{ab}\}_{(a,b)\in A\times B}$ is a family of nonnegative functions with indexes a and b in arbitrary sets A and B, respectively. We call such L_{ab} a *linear integro-differential operator* and also we simply write L without indices.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 47G20, 45K05, 35J60, 35B65, 35D10 (60J75) .

We denote by $\omega_\sigma(y) = 1/(1+|y|^{n+\sigma})$ for $\sigma \in (0,2)$ and we write $\omega := \omega_{\sigma_0}$ for some $\sigma_0 \in (1,2)$. Let $\mathfrak{F}$ denote the family of all real-valued functions defined on $\mathbb{R}^n_T := \mathbb{R}^n \times (-T,0]$. For $u \in \mathfrak{F}$, we define the mixed norm $\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$ by

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} := \sup_{t\in(-T,0]} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u(x,t)|\omega(x)\,dx.$$

Also we denote by $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega) = \{u \in \mathfrak{F} : \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} < \infty\}$.

A mapping $\mathbf{I} : \mathfrak{F} \to \mathfrak{F}$ given by $u \mapsto \mathbf{I}u$ is called a *nonlocal parabolic operator* if

(a) $\mathbf{I}u(x,t)$ is well-defined for any $u \in C^2_x(x,t) \cap L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$,

(b) $\mathbf{I}u$ is continuous on $\Omega_\tau \subset \mathbb{R}^n_T$, whenever $u \in C^2_x(\Omega_\tau) \cap L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$.

We say that a nonlocal operator $\mathbf{I}$ is *uniformly elliptic* with respect to a family $\mathfrak{L}$ of linear integro-differential operators if

$$\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v(x,t) \le \mathbf{I}(u+v)(x,t) - \mathbf{I}u(x,t) \le \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v(x,t) \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}} v(x,t) := \inf_{L\in\mathfrak{L}} Lv(x,t)$ and $\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} v(x,t) := \sup_{L\in\mathfrak{L}} Lv(x,t)$.

We say that an operator L belongs to $\mathfrak{L}_0$ if its corresponding kernel $K \in \mathcal{K}_0$ satisfies the uniform ellipticity assumption

$$(2-\sigma)\frac{\lambda}{|y|^{n+\sigma}} \le K(x,y,t) \le (2-\sigma)\frac{\Lambda}{|y|^{n+\sigma}},\ 0<\sigma<2. \tag{1.3}$$

We consider the corresponding maximal and minimal operators

$$\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} u(x,t) = \sup_{L\in\mathfrak{L}_0} Lu(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\Lambda\mu_t(u,x,y)^+ - \lambda\mu_t(u,x,y)^-}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy,$$
$$\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} u(x,t) = \inf_{L\in\mathfrak{L}_0} Lu(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\lambda\mu_t(u,x,y)^+ - \Lambda\mu_t(u,x,y)^-}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy.$$

In the final section, we shall consider some of the most interesting applications as follows;

- if $0 < \lambda \le c_{ab} \le \Lambda$ and $|\nabla_y c_{ab}| \le C/|y|$, and $c_{ab}(x,y,t)$ is continuous in (x,t) for a modulus of continuity independent of y, then there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ (with an estimate depending on $\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$) such that a solution u of (1.1) is $C^{1,\varepsilon}$.
- if $0 < \lambda \le c_{ab} \le \Lambda$ and $|\nabla_y c_{ab}| \le C/|y|$, c_{ab} is constant in (x,t), and $\Lambda - \delta \le 1 \le \lambda + \delta$ for a small enough $\delta > 0$, then there is some $\varepsilon > 0$ (with an estimate depending on $\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$) such that the solution u of (1.1) is $C^{2,\varepsilon}$.

1.2. **Outline.**

In Section 2, we introduce the notion of viscosity solutions for nonlocal parabolic equations and obtain Hölder regularities and interior $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates of such viscosity solutions by applying the result of [KL] (refer to [CS1] for the elliptic case). In Section 3, we get boundary estimates and global estimates by certain parabolic adaptation of the barrier function which was used in [CS1] for the elliptic case. In Section 4, we establish stability properties of viscosity solutions and it was proved that if two nonlocal parabolic equations are very close to each other in certain sense, then so are those solutions. The parabolic case has time shift contrary to the elliptic case, and so this obstacle shall be overcome in this section. In Section 5, we obtain $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity for nonlocal parabolic equations with variable coefficients. Finally, in Section 6, we furnish a parabolic version of the integral Cordes-Nirenberg type estimates and various applications including $C^{2,\alpha}$-regularity for nonlocal parabolic equations.

1.3. **Notations.** We write the notations briefly for the reader.

(i) $B_r = B_r(0)$ and $\mathbb{R}^n_T = \mathbb{R}^n \times (-T, 0]$ for $r > 0$ and $T > 0$.

(ii) $Q_r = B_r \times (-r^\sigma, 0]$ and $Q_r(x,t) = Q_r + (x,t)$ for $r > 0$ and $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$.

(iii) $\partial_p \Omega_\tau := \partial_x \Omega_\tau \cup \partial_b \Omega_\tau := \partial\Omega \times (-r^\sigma, 0] \cup \Omega \times \{-r^\sigma\}$ for a bounded domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tau \in (0, T]$.

(iv) For $(x,t), (y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$, we define the *parabolic distance* d by

$$\mathrm{d}((x,t),(y,s)) = (|x-y|^\sigma + |t-s|)^{1/\sigma}.$$

(v) For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $a \vee b = \max\{a,b\}$ and $a \wedge b = \min\{a,b\}$.

2. Preliminaries

In this paper, we always impose the following assumptions on ω;

$$1 + |y| \in L^1_\omega, \tag{2.1}$$

$$\sup_{B_r(y)} \omega \le C_r \omega(y). \tag{2.2}$$

The uniform ellipticity (1.2) depends on a class $\mathfrak{L}$ of *linear integro-differential operators.* Such an operator L in $\mathfrak{L}$ is of the form $Lu(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu_t(u,x,y) K(x,y,t)\, dy$ for a nonnegative symmetric kernel K satisfying

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} (1 \wedge |y|^2) K(x,y,t)\, dy \le C < \infty.$$

Here the symmetric property means that for each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$, $K(x,-y,t) = K(x,y,t)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

Let Π be a (possibly unbounded) region in $\mathbb{R}^n$. Then we say that a function $u : \mathbb{R}^n_T \to \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz in space on $\Pi \times (-1, 0]$ (we write $u \in C^{0,1}_x(\Pi \times (-1,0])$), if there is some constant $C > 0$ (independent of x, y) such that

`eq-xlip`

$$\sup_{t\in(-1,0]} |u(x,t) - u(y,t)| \le C|x-y| \tag{2.3}$$

for any $x, y \in \Pi$. We denote by $[u]_{C^{0,1}_x(\Pi\times(-1,0])}$ the smallest C satisfying (2.3).

We say that a function $u : \mathbb{R}^n_T \to \mathbb{R}$ is in $C^{1,1}(Q(x,t))$ for $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$, if there is a constant $M > 0$ (independent of (y,s)) such that

$$|u(y,s) - u(x,s) - (y-x) \cdot \nabla_x u(x,s)| \le M|x-y|^2 \tag{2.4}$$

for all $(y,s) \in Q(x,t)$. We denote by the norm $\|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q(x,t))}$ the smallest M satisfying (2.4).

The following definition is the parabolic setting of that [CS1] of the elliptic case.

Definition 2.1. *For a nonlocal parabolic operator* $\mathbf{I}$ *and* $\tau \in (0,T]$*, we define* $\|\mathbf{I}\|$ *in* Ω_τ *with respect to some weight* ω *as*

$$\|\mathbf{I}\| = \sup_{((x,t),u)\in\mathcal{F}^\epsilon_{\Omega_\tau}} \frac{|\mathbf{I}u(x,t)|}{1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q_\epsilon(x,t))}}$$

where $\mathcal{F}^\epsilon_{\Omega_\tau} = \{((x,t),u) \in \Omega_\tau \times C^2_x(x,t) : \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q_\epsilon(x,t))} < \infty\}$ *for some* $\epsilon > 0$.

Assumption 2.2. *If* $K_{\mathfrak{L}} := \sup_\alpha K_\alpha$ *is the supremum of all kernels corresponding to operators in the class* $\mathfrak{L}$*, then for each* $r > 0$ *there is a constant* $C_r > 0$ *such that* $\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T} K_{\mathfrak{L}}(x,y,t) \le C_r\, \omega(y)$ *for any* $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_r$.

Assumption 2.3. *There is some $C > 0$ such that* $\sup_{L\in\mathfrak{L}} \|L\| \le C < \infty$.

Remark. Assumption 2.3 implies that $\|\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}\| \le C$ and $\|\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}\| \le C$.

Definition 2.4. *Let $\mathbf{I}$ be a uniformly elliptic operator in the sense of* (1.2) *with respect to some class $\mathfrak{L}$ and let $f : \mathbb{R}^n_T \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function. Then a function $u \in \mathfrak{F}$ is upper (lower) semicontinuous on $\overline{\Omega} \times J$ where $J := (a, b) \subset (-T, 0]$ is said to be a* viscosity subsolution (viscosity supersolution) *of an equation $\partial_t u - \mathbf{I}u = f$ on $\Omega \times J$ and we write $\partial_t u - \mathbf{I}u \le f$ ($\partial_t u - \mathbf{I}u \ge f$) on $\Omega \times J$ in the viscosity sense, if for each $(x, t) \in \Omega \times J$ there is some neighborhood $Q_r(x, t) \subset \Omega \times J$ of (x, t) such that $\partial_t\varphi(x, t) - \mathbf{I}v(x, t) \le f(x, t)$ ($\partial_t\varphi(x, t) - \mathbf{I}v(x, t) \ge f(x, t)$) for $v = \varphi \mathbb{1}_{Q_r(x,t)} + u\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n_T\setminus Q_r(x,t)}$ whenever $\varphi \in C^2(Q_r(x, t))$ with $\varphi(x, t) = u(x, t)$ and $\varphi > u$ ($\varphi < u$) on $Q_r(x, t) \setminus \{(x, t)\}$ exists. Also a function u is called as a* viscosity solution *if it is both a viscosity subsolution and a viscosity supersolution to $\partial_t u - \mathbf{I}u = f$ on $\Omega \times J$.*

Throughout this paper, *we denote $\eta \in (0, 1)$ by any very small number and we set $\epsilon = \eta/2$.*

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ for some $\sigma_0 \in (0, 2)$. If $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ is a function satisfying*

$$\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} u - \partial_t u \ge -C_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} u - \partial_t u \le C_0 \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta},$$

then there are some $\alpha > 0$ and $C > 0$ (depending only on $\lambda, \Lambda, n, \eta$ and σ_0, but not on σ) such that

$$\|u\|_{C^\alpha(Q_{1+\epsilon})} \le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + C_0\big).$$

Proof. We note that u is continuous on $\overline{Q}_{1+\eta}$. Set $v = u\mathbb{1}_{Q_{1+\eta}}$ and $w = u\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n_T\setminus Q_{1+\eta}}$. Since $u = v + w$ and $\partial_t w \equiv 0$ on $Q_{1+\epsilon}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} v - \partial_t v) + \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} w &\ge \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} u - \partial_t u \ge -C_0 \ \text{ in } Q_{1+\epsilon},\\ (\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} v - \partial_t v) + \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} w &\le \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} u - \partial_t u \le C_0 \quad \text{ in } Q_{1+\epsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to show that if $(x, t) \in Q_{1+\epsilon}$, then $|Lw(x, t)| \le C\,\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$ for any $L \in \mathfrak{L}_0$, i.e. we have only to show that if $(x, t) \in Q_{1+\epsilon}$, then

$$\left|\int_{|y|\ge 1+\eta} u(y, t)K(x, \pm y, t)\, dy\right| \le C\,\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$$

for any $L \in \mathfrak{L}_0$. Indeed, we note that $|y| > \frac{2(1+\eta)}{2+\eta}|x|$ for any $x \in B_{1+\epsilon}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{1+\eta}$, and so $|x \pm y| \ge |y| - |x| \ge \frac{\eta}{2(1+\eta)}|y|$. Thus we have the estimate

$$\left|\int_{|y|\ge 1+\eta} u(y, t)K(x, \pm y, t)\, dy\right| \le C\int_{|y|\ge 1+\eta} \frac{|u(y, t)|}{|x \pm y|^{n+\sigma}}\, dy \le C\,\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} v \ge -C_0 - C\,\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \ \text{ and } \ \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} v \le C_0 + C\,\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \ \text{ in } Q_{1+\epsilon}.$$

Hence we complete the proof by applying Theorem 5.1.2 [KL] to v. □

We define the class $\mathfrak{L}_*$ of operators L with kernels $K \in \mathcal{K}_*$ satisfying (1.3) such that there are some $\varrho_0 > 0$ and a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T} |\nabla_y K(x, y, t)| \le C\,\omega(y) \ \text{ for any } y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{\varrho_0}. \tag{2.5}$$

Theorem 2.6. *Let* $\sigma \in [\sigma_0, 2)$ *for some* $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$*. Then there is some* $\varrho_0 > 0$ (*depending on* $\lambda, \Lambda, \sigma_0$ *and* n) *so that if* $\mathbf{I}$ *is a nonlocal, translation-invariant and uniformly elliptic operator with respect to* $\mathfrak{L}_*$ *and* $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ *satisfies* $\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u = 0$ *in* $Q_{1+\eta}$*, then there are some* $\alpha > 0$ *and* $C > 0$ (*depending only on* $\lambda, \Lambda, n, \eta$ *and* σ_0*, but not on* σ) *such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})} \le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}\big)$$

where the constant C *also depends on the constant in* (2.5).

Remark. We note that it follows from the standard telescopic sum argument [CC] and Theorem 2.5 that

$$[u]_{C^{0,1}_x(Q_{1+\eta})} \le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}\big). \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. The proof of this theorem goes along the lines of the proof of Theorem 12.1 in [CS2] by applying Theorem 2.5 to the difference quotients in the x-direction

$$w^h(x,t) = \frac{u(x+h,t) - u(x,t)}{|h|^\beta}$$

for $\beta = \alpha, 2\alpha, \cdots, 1$. Write $w^h = w^h_1 + w^h_2$ where $w^h_1 = w^h \chi_{Q_r}$ for $r \in (1+\epsilon, 1+\eta)$. By Theorem 2.0.4 [KL], we have that $\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h - \partial_t w^h \ge 0$ and $\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h - \partial_t w^h \le 0$ in Q_r. Since $\partial_t w^h_2 \equiv 0$ in Q_r for h with $|h| < 1+\eta-r$, it follows from uniform ellipticity with respect to $\mathfrak{L}_*$ that we have that

$$\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} w^h_1 - \partial_t w^h_1 \ge \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_1 - \partial_t w^h_1 \ge \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h - \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_2 - \partial_t w^h_1 \ge -\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_2 \quad \text{in } Q_r,$$
$$\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} w^h_1 - \partial_t w^h_1 \le \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_1 - \partial_t w^h_1 \le \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h - \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_2 - \partial_t w^h_1 \le -\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_2 \quad \text{in } Q_r.$$

If we can show that $|\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_2| \vee |\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_*} w^h_2| \le c\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$, then we have that

$$\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0} w^h_1 - \partial_t w^h_1 \ge -c\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \text{ and } \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_0} w^h_1 - \partial_t w^h_1 \le c\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \text{ in } Q_r$$

for h with $|h| < 1+\eta-r$. Indeed, it can be obtained from the fact that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_\rho} |u(x+y,t)| \frac{|K(x,y,t) - K(x,y-h,t)|}{|h|}\,dy + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_\rho} |u(x+y+h,t)| K(x,y,t)\,dy \le C\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$$

for some $\rho > 0$ (this can be seen by using (2.2) and (2.5)). Hence u admits the required $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates on $Q_{1+\epsilon}$ in the x-direction.

Now we are going to show that u is $C^{(1+\alpha)/\sigma}$-Hölder continuous in time, following Lemma 2 in [CW]. For $(x_0, t_0) \in Q_{1+\epsilon}$, we consider

$$w(x,t) = \frac{u(rx + x_0, r^\sigma t + t_0) - u(x_0,t_0) - r\nabla u(x_0,t_0)\cdot x}{r^{1+\alpha}}$$

for small $r > 0$. Without loss of generality, let us assume that $[u]_{C^{0,1}_x(Q_{1+\eta})} \le 1$. Then w solves the given parabolic equation, and so $C^{1,\alpha}$-regularity of u in x on $Q_{1+\eta}$ implies $[w]_{C^{0,1}_x(Q_1)} \le 1$ and $|w(x,0)| \le 1$ with $w(0,0) = 0$. Thus as in the proof of Lemma 2 [CW], it easily follows from comparison principle [KL] that w is uniformly bounded in Q_1, which implies the conclusion. □

3. BOUNDARY ESTIMATES AND GLOBAL ESTIMATES

In this section, we realize that a modulus of continuity on the parabolic boundary of the domain of some equation makes it possible to obtain another modulus of continuity inside the domain. This can be established by controlling the growth of u away from its boundary data through barriers, scaling and interior regularity.

We use a barrier function which was used in [CS1] for the elliptic case and adapted to our parabolic setting. This barrier function is appropriate as a supersolution of $\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma \psi \le 0$ for all values of σ greater than a given σ_0, where $\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma$ denotes the maximal operator $\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)}$. Another way to say this would be to define a larger class $\mathfrak{L}$ which is the union of all classes $\mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$, then $\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}} \psi \le 0$. The proof of the following lemma can be achieved by a little modification to our parabolic setting (refer to [CS1]), and so we leave the proof for the reader.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$ be given. Then, for any $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ and $\gamma \in (0,1)$, there are some $\alpha > 0$ and $r > 0$ so small that the function $g_\alpha(x,t) = (|x|-1)^\alpha_+$ satisfies $\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma g_\alpha \le -1/[(2^\sigma - 1)\gamma^\sigma]$ in $(B_{1+r} \setminus B_1) \times (-T, 0]$.*

Corollary 3.2. *Let $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$ be given. Then, for any $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ and $\gamma \in (0,1)$, there is a continuous function ψ defined on $\mathbb{R}^n_T$ such that (a) $\psi = 0$ in Q_1, (b) $\psi \ge 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_T$, (c) $\psi \ge \gamma^{-\sigma}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_2$, (d) $\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma \psi - \partial_t \psi \le 0$ and $\partial_t \psi \ge -[(2^\sigma - 1)\gamma^\sigma]^{-1}$ in $\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$.*

Proof. We consider $\psi(x,t) = \min\{\gamma^{-\sigma}, C(|x|-1)^\alpha_+\} + (t+1)_-/[(2^\sigma - 1)\gamma^\sigma]$ for some large constant $C > 0$ and apply Lemma 3.1. □

The function ψ that we obtained in Corollary 3.2 shall be utilized as a barrier to prove the boundary continuity of solutions to nonlocal parabolic equations. We observe that ψ is a supersolution outside the parabolic cylinder Q_1.

Throughout this section, we denote $\eta \in (0,1)$ by any very small number.

Theorem 3.3. *Let $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ for $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$. If $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ satisfies that*

$$\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma u - \partial_t u \ge -C \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{M}^-_\sigma u - \partial_t u \le C \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta},$$

$$|u(y,s) - u(x,t)| \le \rho((|x-y|^\sigma + |t-s|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for every $(x,t) \in \partial_p Q_1$ and $(y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \backslash Q_1$, where ρ is a modulus of continuity, then there is another modulus of continuity $\bar\rho$ (depending only on $\rho, \lambda, \Lambda, \sigma_0, n, \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$, η and C, but not on σ) such that

$$|u(y,s) - u(x,t)| \le \bar\rho((|x-y|^\sigma + |t-s|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for every $(x,t) \in \overline{Q}_1$ and $(y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ for $\sigma_0 \in (0,2)$. If $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ is a function such that*

$$\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma u - \partial_t u \ge -C \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta},$$

$$u(x,t) - u(x_0,t_0) \le \rho((|x-x_0|^\sigma + |t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for every $(x_0,t_0) \in \partial_p Q_1$ and $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$, where ρ is a modulus of continuity, then there is another modulus of continuity $\tilde\rho$ (depending only on $\rho, \lambda, \Lambda, \sigma_0, n, \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$, η and C, but not on σ) such that

$$u(x,t) - u(x_0,t_0) \le \tilde\rho((|x-x_0|^\sigma + |t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for every $(x_0,t_0) \in \partial_p Q_1$ and $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$.

Proof. If we write $v = u\mathbb{1}_{Q_{1+\eta}}$, then as before we have that

$$\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma v - \partial_t v \geq -c_\eta - \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \;\text{ and }\; \mathbf{M}^-_\sigma v - \partial_t v \leq c_\eta + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \;\text{ in } Q_1.$$

Since u is continuous on $\overline{Q}_{1+\eta}$, we may assume that $u \in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$.

Since $\sigma \geq \sigma_0 > 0$, the function $p(x,t) = \frac{1}{4}(0 \vee (4-|x|^2)) + (C + 4\Lambda\omega_n(2-\sigma)\frac{1-3^{-\sigma}}{\sigma})t$ satisfies $\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma p \leq -\lambda\omega_n + 4\Lambda\omega_n(2-\sigma)\frac{1-3^{-\sigma}}{\sigma}$ in Q_1, because

$$\begin{aligned} Lp(x,t) &= -\int_{B_1} |y|^2 K(x,y,t)\,dy + \int_{B_3\setminus B_1} \mu_t(p,x,y) K(x,y,t)\,dy \\ &\leq -\lambda\omega_n + 4\Lambda\omega_n(2-\sigma)\frac{1-3^{-\sigma}}{\sigma} \end{aligned}$$

for any $L \in \mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)$ and all $(x,t) \in Q_1$, where ω_n denotes the surface measure of S^{n-1}. Since $\partial_t p = C + 4\Lambda\omega_n(2-\sigma)\frac{1-3^{-\sigma}}{\sigma}$ in Q_1, we have that

$$\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma\big(u-p\big) - \partial_t\big(u-p\big) \geq \mathbf{M}^+_\sigma u - \partial_t u - \mathbf{M}^+_\sigma p + \partial_t p \geq \lambda\omega_n \geq 0 \;\text{ in } Q_1. \tag{3.1}$$

Let ρ_0 be the modulus of continuity of the function ψ in Corollary 3.2 and let ρ_1 be the modulus of continuity of the function p. By the assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &u(x,t) - p(x,t) - u(x_0,t_0) + p(x_0,t_0) \\ &\qquad \leq \rho((|x-x_0|^\sigma + |t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma}) + \rho_1((|x-x_0|^\sigma + |t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

for every $(x_0,t_0) \in \partial_p Q_1$ and $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$.

Fix any $(x_0,t_0) \in \partial_p Q_1$. For $r > 0$, we define $\bar\rho$ by

$$\bar\rho(r) = \inf_{\gamma\in(0,1)} \left(\rho(3\gamma) + \rho_1(3\gamma) + \big\|u - p - u(x_0,t_0) + p(x_0,t_0)\big\|_{L^\infty}\rho_0\left(\frac{r}{\gamma}\right)\right).$$

Then we must show that $\bar\rho$ is a modulus of continuity. We easily see that $\bar\rho$ is clearly monotonically increasing because ρ_0 is. So we have only to show that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some $r > 0$ such that $\bar\rho(r) < \varepsilon$. Indeed, we choose some $\gamma \in (0,1)$ such that $\rho(3\gamma) + \rho_1(3\gamma) < \varepsilon/2$, and then choose some $r > 0$ so that $\|u - p - u(x_0,t_0) + p(x_0,t_0)\|_{L^\infty}\,\rho_0(r/\gamma) < \varepsilon/2$. Finally, we show that there is a modulus of continuity $\tilde\rho$ such that $u(x,t) - u(x_0,t_0) \leq \tilde\rho((|x-x_0|^\sigma + |t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma})$ for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$. Take any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$. For $\gamma > 0$, we consider a barrier function

$$\begin{aligned} B(x,t) &= u(x_0,t_0) - p(x_0,t_0) + \rho(3\gamma) + \rho_1(3\gamma) \\ &\qquad + \gamma^\sigma\big\|u - p - u(x_0,t_0) + p(x_0,t_0)\big\|_{L^\infty}\psi\left(-x_0 + \frac{x-x_0}{\gamma}, \frac{t-t_0}{\gamma^\sigma}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By (3.2) and the definition of ψ, we have that

$$B(x,t) \geq u(x_0,t_0) - p(x_0,t_0) + \rho(3\gamma) + \rho_1(3\gamma) \geq u(x,t) - p(x,t)$$

for any $(x,t) \in Q_{3\gamma}(x_0,t_0) \cap (\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1)$. Also by the definition of ψ, we obtain that $B(x,t) \geq u(x,t) - p(x,t)$ for any $(x,t) \in (\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_{3\gamma}(x_0,t_0)) \cap (\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1)$. Thus we have that $B \geq u - p$ on $\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$. By (d) of Corollary 3.2, we see that $\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma\psi - \partial_t\psi \leq 0$ in $Q_{1/\gamma}(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}x_0, 0)$ because $Q_{1/\gamma}(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}x_0, 0) \subset \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$. We observe that

$$\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma\psi - \partial_t\psi \leq 0 \;\text{ in } Q_{1/\gamma}\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{\gamma}x_0, 0\right) \;\Leftrightarrow\; \mathbf{M}^+_\sigma B - \partial_t B \leq 0 \;\text{ in } Q_1,$$

by Corollary 3.2. Taking the infimum on γ, it follows from comparison principle (Theorem 2.0.3 in [KL]) that

$$u(x,t)-p(x,t)\le B(x,t)\le u(x_0,t_0)-p(x_0,t_0)+\bar\rho((|x-x_0|^\sigma+|t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for all $(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T$, because

$$\psi(x,t)\le|\psi(x,t)-\psi(x_0,t_0)|\le\rho_0((|x-x_0|^\sigma+|t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma}),\forall(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T.$$

Hence we have that $u(x,t)-u(x_0,t_0)\le\tilde\rho((|x-x_0|^\sigma+|t-t_0|)^{1/\sigma})$ for all $(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T$, where $\tilde\rho=\rho_1+\bar\rho$. Therefore we complete the proof. □

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\sigma\in(\sigma_0,2)$ for $\sigma_0\in(0,2)$. If $u\in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ satisfies that*

$$\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma u-\partial_t u\ge -C\ \ \text{and}\ \ \mathbf{M}^-_\sigma u-\partial_t u\le C\ \ \text{in } Q_{1+\eta},$$

$$|u(y,s)-u(x,t)|\le\rho((|x-y|^\sigma+|t-s|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for every $(x,t)\in\partial_p Q_1$ and $(y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T$, where ρ is a modulus of continuity, then there is another modulus of continuity $\bar\rho$ (depending only on $\rho,\lambda,\Lambda,\sigma_0,n,\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$, η and C, but not on σ) such that

$$|u(y,s)-u(x,t)|\le\bar\rho((|x-y|^\sigma+|t-s|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for every $(x,t)\in\overline{Q}_1$ and $(y,s)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T$.

Proof. If we set $v=u\mathbb{1}_{Q_{1+\eta}}$, then as before we have that

$$\mathbf{M}^+_\sigma v-\partial_t v\ge -c_\eta-\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}\ \ \text{and}\ \ \mathbf{M}^-_\sigma v-\partial_t v\le c_\eta+\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}\ \ \text{in } Q_1.$$

Since u is continuous on $\overline{Q}_{1+\eta}$, we may assume that $u\in \mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$. Hence it can easily be obtained by an adaptation of Lemma 3 in [CS1] to our parabolic setting. □

Proof of Theorem 3.3. We apply Lemma 3.4 to both u and $-u$ to obtain a modulus of continuity that applies from any point on $\partial_p Q_1$ to any point in $\mathbb{R}^n_T$. Then we use Lemma 3.5 to finish the proof. □

4. Some results by approximation

In this section, we show that two equations which are very close to each other in some appropriate way have their solutions which are close by each other on the unit cube Q_1.

In what follows, for a function $u:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ and a quadratic polynomial p we denote by $u^p_{Q_r(x_0,t_0)}\doteqdot p\mathbb{1}_{Q_r(x_0,t_0)}+u\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n_T\setminus Q_r(x_0,t_0)}$. The following lemma is an usual result in analysis on viscosity solutions, and so we will skip the proof.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathbf{I}$ be a uniformly elliptic operator in the sense of (1.2) with respect to some class $\mathfrak{L}$ and let $u:\mathbb{R}^n_T\to\mathbb{R}$ be a function which is upper semicontinuous on $\overline{\Omega}_\tau$. Then the followings are equivalent.*

(a) u is a viscosity subsolution of $\mathbf{I}u-\partial_t u=f$ in Ω_τ, i.e. $\mathbf{I}u-\partial_t u\ge f$ in Ω_τ.

(b) If p is a quadratic polynomial satisfying $u(x_0,t_0)=p(x_0,t_0)$ and $u\le p$ in $Q_r(x_0,t_0)$ where $Q_r(x_0,t_0)\subset\Omega_\tau$ for some $r>0$ and $(x_0,t_0)\in\Omega_\tau$, then we have that $\mathbf{I}u^p_r(x_0,t_0)-\partial_t u^p_r(x_0,t_0)\ge f(x_0,t_0)$ for $u^p_r=u^p_{Q_r(x_0,t_0)}$.

We want to show that if $\mathbf{I}_k u_k(x,t)=f_k(x,t)$ and $\mathbf{I}_k\to\mathbf{I}$, $u_k\to u$ and $f_k\to f$ in some appropriate way, then $\mathbf{I}u(x,t)=f(x,t)$.

In the elliptic case [CS1], the solution space L^1_ω is enough for the weakly convergence of operators $\mathbf{I}_k$. But, in the parabolic case, the possible substitute $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ for the solution space L^1_ω is not enough for it, because solutions for the parabolic case have the time shift. Thus we impose the additional condition $C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$ to get the weakly convergence of operators $\mathbf{I}_k$. This makes it possible to obtain the stability properties for the nonlocal parabolic case.

Definition 4.2. *We say that* $\mathbf{I}_k$ converges weakly to $\mathbf{I}$ *in* Ω_τ *with respect to* ω *(and we denote by* $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{I}_k =_\omega \mathbf{I}$ *in* Ω_τ*), if for any* $(x_0,t_0)\in\Omega_\tau$ *there is some* $Q_r(x_0,t_0)\subset\Omega_\tau$ *such that*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r = \mathbf{I}u^p_r \tag{4.1}$$

uniformly in $Q_{r/2}(x_0,t_0)$ *for any function* u^p_r *of the form* $u^p_r = u^p_{Q_r(x_0,t_0)}$ *where* p *is a quadratic polynomial and* $u\in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)\cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let* $\{\mathbf{I}_k\}$ *be a sequence of uniformly elliptic operators with respect to some class* $\mathfrak{L}$. *Assume that Assumption 2.3 holds. Let* $\{u_k\}$ *be a sequence of lower semicontinuous functions in* Ω_τ *such that*
(a) $\mathbf{I}_k u_k - \partial_t u_k \le f_k$ *in* Ω_τ, *(b)* $\lim_{k\to\infty} u_k = u$ *in the* Γ *sense in* Ω_τ,
(c) $\lim_{k\to\infty}\|u_k-u\|_{L^\infty_\tau(L^1_\omega)} = 0$, *(d)* $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{I}_k =_\omega \mathbf{I}$ *in* Ω_τ,
(e) $\lim_{k\to\infty} f_k = f\in C(\Omega_\tau)$ *locally uniformly in* Ω_τ,
(f) $\sup_{k\in\mathbb{N}}\sup_{\Omega_\tau}|u_k|\le C<\infty$.
Then we have that $\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u \le f$ *in* Ω_τ.

Proof. Let p be a quadratic polynomial touching u from below at a point (x,t) in a neighborhood $V\subset\Omega_\tau$. Since $\{u_k\}$ Γ-converges to u in Ω_τ, there are a cylinder $Q_r(x,t)\subset V$ and a sequence $\{(x_k,t_k)\}\subset Q_r(x,t)$ with $\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathrm{d}((x_k,t_k),(x,t)) = 0$ such that p touches u_k from below at (x_k,t_k)(refer to [GD]). Without loss of generality, we may assume that $Q_r(x,t)$ is a cylinder so that (4.1) holds for the point (x,t).

If we set $(u_k)^p_r = (u_k)^p_{Q_r(x,t)}$, then we have $\mathbf{I}(u_k)^p_r(x_k,t_k)\le f(x_k,t_k)$. If we set $u^p_r = u^p_{Q_r(x,t)}$, then we see that $u^p_r(z,q) = (u_k)^p_r(z,q)$ and $\partial_t(u_k)^p_r(z,q) = \partial_t u^p_r(z,q)$ for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $(z,q)\in Q_r(x,t)$. Take any $(z,q)\in Q_{r/4}(x,t)$. Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{I}_k(u_k)^p_r(z,q) - \partial_t(u_k)^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q) + \partial_t u^p_r(z,q)| \\
&\le |\mathbf{I}_k(u_k)^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q)| + |\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q)| \\
&\le |\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}((u_k)^p_r - u^p_r)(z,q)| \vee |\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}(u^p_r - (u_k)^p_r)(z,q)| + |\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q)| \\
&\le \sup_{L\in\mathfrak{L}} |L((u_k)^p_r - u^p_r)(z,q)| + |\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q)| \\
&\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_{r/2}} |\mu_q((u_k)^p_r - u^p_r, z, y)| K(x,y,t)\,dy + |\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q)| \\
&\le C_r\int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_{r/2}} \big\{|((u_k)^p_r - u^p_r)(z+y,q)| + |((u_k)^p_r - u^p_r)(z-y,q)|\big\}\omega(y)\,dy \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad + |\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q)| \\
&\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} 2|(u_k)^p_r(y,q) - u^p_r(y,q)| \sup_{z\in B_{r/4}}\omega(y+z)\,dy + |\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q)| \\
&\le C\|u_k - u\|_{L^\infty_\tau(L^1_\omega)} + |\mathbf{I}_k u^p_r(z,q) - \mathbf{I}u^p_r(z,q)| \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $k\to\infty$, by using Assumption 2.3 and (2.2). Since $(u_k)^p_r\in C^2(Q_r(x,t))\cap L^\infty_\tau(L^1_\omega)$ for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty}\|u_k-u\|_{L^\infty_\tau(L^1_\omega)} = 0$, we see $u^p_r\in C^2(Q_r(x,t))\cap L^\infty_\tau(L^1_\omega)$, and thus $\mathbf{I}u_r^p$ is continuous in $Q_r(x,t)$. Thus by (4.1) we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\mathbf{I}_k(u_k)_r^p(x_k,t_k) - \partial_t(u_k)_r^p(x_k,t_k) - \mathbf{I}u_r^p(x,t) + \partial_t u_r^p(x,t)| \\
&\qquad \le |\mathbf{I}_k(u_k)_r^p(x_k,t_k) - \partial_t(u_k)_r^p(x_k,t_k) - \mathbf{I}u_r^p(x_k,t_k) + \partial_t u_r^p(x_k,t_k)| \\
&\qquad\quad + |\mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(x_k,t_k) - \mathbf{I}u_r^p(x_k,t_k)| + |\mathbf{I}u_r^p(x_k,t_k) - \mathbf{I}u_r^p(x,t)| \\
&\qquad\quad + |\partial_t u_r^p(x_k,t_k) - \partial_t u_r^p(x,t)| \to 0
\end{aligned}$$

as $k\to\infty$. Since $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathrm{d}((x_k,t_k),(x,t)) = 0$ and $\lim_{k\to\infty} f_k = f \in C(\Omega_\tau)$ locally uniformly in Ω_τ, we have that $f_k(x_k,t_k)\to f(x,t)$. Therefore this implies that $\mathbf{I}u_r^p(x,t) - \partial_t u_r^p(x,t) \le f(x,t)$. Hence we conclude that $\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u \le f$ in Ω_τ. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let $u_r^p = u^p_{Q_r}$ where p is a quadratic polynomial and $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)\cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$. If $\{\mathbf{I}_k\}$ is a sequence of uniformly elliptic operators with respect to some class $\mathfrak{L}$ satisfying Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3, then there is a subsequence $\{\mathbf{I}_{k_j}\}$ such that $\mathbf{I}_{k_j}u_r^p$ converges uniformly in $Q_{r/2}$.*

Proof. We have only to find a uniform modulus of continuity for $\mathbf{I}_{k_j}u_r^p$ in Q_r so that the lemma follows from Arzela-Ascoli Theorem.

Take any two $(x,t),(y,s)\in Q_{r/2}$ with $\mathrm{d}((x,t),(y,s)) < r/8$. Then there exists some large $R>0$ so that the function $\varphi_R \in C^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$ defined by

$$\varphi_R = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{on } \overline{B}_R \times (-T+2,0] \\ 0 & \text{on } \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus (B_{R+1}\times(-T+1,0]) \end{cases}$$

satisfies $\|u-v\|_{L^\infty(L^1_\omega)} < (|x-y|^\sigma + |s-t|)^{1/\sigma}$ where $v = \varphi_R\, u$. So we may assume that $u\in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)\cap C_c(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$. We denote by $\tau_z u(x,t) = u(x+z,t)$ for $z\in\mathbb{R}^n$. By the uniform ellipticity of $\mathbf{I}_k$, we have that

$$\mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(x,t) - \mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(y,t) \le \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}(u_r^p - \tau_{y-x}u_r^p)(x,t). \tag{4.2}$$

Also we see that $u_r^p - \tau_{y-x}u_r^p = 0$ in $B_{r/4}(x)\times t$, because

$$p(x+z,t) + p(x-z,t) - 2p(x,t) - p(y+z,t) - p(y-z,t) + 2p(y,t) = 0$$

for any $z\in B_{r/4}$. From (2.2) and Assumption 2.3, for any $L\in\mathfrak{L}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&L(u_r^p - \tau_{y-x}u_r^p)(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_{r/4}} \mu_t(u_r^p - \tau_{y-x}u_r^p, x, z) K(x,z,t)\,dz \\
&= \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_{r/4}} \left[u_r^p(x+z,t) + u_r^p(x-z,t) - 2u_r^p(x,t)\right] K(x,z,t)\,dz \\
&\qquad - \int_{\mathbb{R}^n\setminus B_{r/4}} \left[u_r^p(y+z,t) + u_r^p(y-z,t) - 2u_r^p(y,t)\right] K(x,z,t)\,dz \\
&\le C_r\big(|p(x,t)-p(y,t)| + \|\tau_x u_r^p - \tau_y u_r^p\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}\big) \\
&\le C_r \sup_{\substack{|\xi-\eta|\le|x-y| \\ \xi,\eta\in B_{r/2}}} \left(|p(\xi,t)-p(\eta,t)| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\tau_{\xi-\eta}u_r^p(z,t) - u_r^p(z,t)| \big(\sup_{B_r(z)} \omega\big)\,dz \right) \\
&\le \mathfrak{m}_1(|x-y|)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{m}_1$ is defined as $\mathfrak{m}_1(\varrho) = \sup_{t\in(-r/2,r/2]} \mathfrak{m}_t(\varrho)$ and

$$\mathfrak{m}_t(\varrho) = C_r \sup_{\substack{|\xi-\eta|\le\varrho \\ \xi,\eta\in B_{r/2}}} \left(|p(\xi,t)-p(\eta,t)| + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\tau_{\xi-\eta}u_r^p(\,\cdot\,,t) - u_r^p(\,\cdot\,,t)|\,\omega(z)\,dz \right).$$

Thus by (4.2) we obtain that

$$\mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(x,t) - \mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(y,t) \le \mathfrak{m}_1(|x-y|). \tag{4.3}$$

On the other hand, we now estimate $\mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(y,t) - \mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(y,s)$. Since p and u are uniformly continuous on $\overline{Q}_r$ and $\mathbb{R}^n$, respectively, we easily obtain that

$$\mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(y,t) - \mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(y,s) \le \mathfrak{m}_2(|t-s|^{1/\sigma}) \tag{4.4}$$

for some modulus of continuity $\mathfrak{m}_2$ depending on u but not on $\mathbf{I}_k$. Hence by (4.3) and (4.4) we conclude that

$$\mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(x,t) - \mathbf{I}_k u_r^p(y,s) \le \mathfrak{m}((|x-y|^\sigma + |t-s|)^{1/\sigma})$$

where $\mathfrak{m}((|x-y|^\sigma + |t-s|)^{1/\sigma}) = \mathfrak{m}_1(|x-y|) + \mathfrak{m}_2(|t-s|^{1/\sigma})$. Here it is clear that $\mathfrak{m}(\varrho)$ is a modulus of continuity depending on u but not on $\mathbf{I}_k$. Therefore there is a subsequence that converges uniformly by Arzela-Ascoli Theorem. □

Theorem 4.5. *Let $\{\mathbf{I}_k\}$ be a sequence of uniformly elliptic operators with respect to some class $\mathfrak{L}$ satisfying Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3 Then there is a subsequence $\{\mathbf{I}_{k_j}\}$ that converges weakly.*

Proof. We first construct a dense subset $\mathcal{E}$ of the set $\mathcal{T}$ of test functions given by

$$\mathcal{T} = \left\{ u^p_{Q_r} : p \in \Pi_{n+1}, u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T) \right\}, \tag{4.5}$$

where Π_{n+1} is the set of all quadratic polynomials on $\mathbb{R}^{n+1}$. In order to do this, we shall find a countable dense subset of $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$. Since $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$, without loss of generality we may assume that $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathcal{D}_k$ be a countable dense subset of $C(\overline{B}_k \times [-T,0])$ under the uniform norm $\|\cdot\|_k$ on $\overline{B}_k \times [-T,0]$. If we set $\mathcal{D} = \bigcup_{k=1}^\infty \mathcal{D}_k$, then $\mathcal{D}$ is a countable dense subset of $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$ under the norm on $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$; indeed, if $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$, then we may write $u(x,t) = u(x,t)\varphi_k(x) + u(x,t)(1-\varphi_k(x))$ where, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi_k \in C^\infty_c(\overline{B}_k)$ is a function such that $0 \le \varphi_k \le 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^n$, $\varphi_k \equiv 1$ on $\overline{B}_{k-1}$ and $\varphi_k \equiv 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_k$. Fix any $\varepsilon > 0$. Choose some $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $u_N \in \mathcal{D}_N \subset \mathcal{D}$ so that

$$\|u(1-\varphi_N)\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} < \varepsilon/2,$$

$$\|u\varphi_N - u_N\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \le \|\omega\|_{L^1(\mathbb{R}^n)} \|u\varphi_N - u_N\|_N < \varepsilon/2.$$

Thus we have that $\|u - u_N\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} < \varepsilon$.

Now we can take a countable dense subset $\mathcal{D} := \{u_j\}$ of $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega) \cap C(\mathbb{R}^n_T)$ under the norm on $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$. The set of all quadratic polynomials is a finite dimensional space which has a countable dense subset $\{p_j\}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we set $v_{k,j_1,j_2} = p_{j_1}\mathbb{1}_{Q_{2^{-k}}} + u_{j_2}\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_{2^{-k}}}$. Take any $\varepsilon > 0$ and any v as in (4.1), i.e. $v = u^p_{Q_r}$ for some $p \in \Pi_{n+1}$ and $r > 0$. Then we choose k so that $2^{-k} < r < 2^{-k+1}$ and select some j_1 and j_2 such that $\|u_{j_2} - u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} < \varepsilon$, and $|D^2_x p_{j_1} - D^2_x p| < \varepsilon$, $|D_x p_{j_1} - D_x p| < \varepsilon$ and $|p_{j_1} - p| < \varepsilon$ in $Q_{2^{-k}}$. Since the set $\mathcal{E} = \{v_{k,j_1,j_2}\}$ is countable and dense, we can arrange it in a sequence v_j of the form $v_j = p_j \mathbb{1}_{Q_{r_j}} + u_j \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_{r_j}}$ so that for each v as in (4.1) there is some v_j such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|v - v_j\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} < \varepsilon, \\ &\sup_{Q_{r/2}} |D^k v - D^k v_j| < \varepsilon \text{ for all } k = 0,1,2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

By Lemma 4.4, for each $v_j \in \mathcal{E}$ there exists a subsequence $\mathbf{I}_{k_i}$ such that $\mathbf{I}_{k_i}(v_j)$ converges uniformly in $Q_{r_j/2}$.

By a standard diagonalization process, there is a subsequence $\{\mathbf{I}_{k_i}\}$ such that for each v_j, $\{\mathbf{I}_{k_i} v_j\}$ converges uniformly in $Q_{r_j/2}$. We call this limit $\mathbf{I}_* v_j(x,t)$. If v is any test function, then there is some j such that v is close enough to v_j in the sense of (4.2). Take any $(x,t) \in Q_{r/2}$. By the mean value theorem, we see that

$$\mu_t(v - v_j, x, y) = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \langle D_x^2(v - v_j)((x + \tau y) - 2s\tau y, t)y, y\rangle \, ds \, d\tau$$

for any $y \in B_{r/2}$. Thus it follows from (2.2), (4.2), (4.6) and Assumption 2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}_k v(x,t) - \mathbf{I}_k v_j(x,t) &\le \left(\int_{B_{r/2}} + \int_{\mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{r/2}} \right) \mu_t(v - v_j, x, y) K_{\mathfrak{L}}(x,y,t) \, dy \\ &\le C\varepsilon + C \left\| v - v_j \right\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} \le C\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

for any $(x,t) \in Q_{r/2}$, uniformly in k. Taking i large enough, we thus have that

$$|\mathbf{I}_{k_i} v(x,t) - \mathbf{I}_* v_j(x,t)| < 2\varepsilon,$$

and thus $\{\mathbf{I}_{k_i} v(x,t)\}$ is a Cauchy sequence in $L^\infty(Q_{r/2})$. We define $\mathbf{I}_* v(x,t)$ to be the uniform limit of this sequence in $Q_{r/2}$. Thus we have shown that $\{\mathbf{I}_k v(x,t)\}$ converges uniformly to $\mathbf{I}_* v(x)$ in $Q_{r/2}$.

To finish the proof, we must show that the operator $\mathbf{I}_*$ can be extended to a uniformly elliptic operator for all test functions φ. We note that for any two test functions $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{T}$, we have that

$$\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}(v_1 - v_2)(x,t) \le \mathbf{I}_k(v_1 - v_2)(x,t) \le \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}(v_1 - v_2)(x,t).$$

Passing to the limit in this inequality, we obtain that

$$\mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}}(v_1 - v_2)(x,t) \le \mathbf{I}_*(v_1 - v_2)(x,t) \le \mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}}(v_1 - v_2)(x,t).$$

Approximating on an arbitrary test function φ as in the proof of Lemma 4.1, we can extend $\mathbf{I}_*$ in a unique way to all test functions φ such that $\mathbf{I}_*$ is uniformly elliptic with respect to $\mathfrak{L}$. □

Lemma 4.6. *For some $\sigma \ge \sigma_0 > 1$ and $\gamma \in (0, \sigma_0 - 1)$, let $\mathbf{I}_0, \mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ be nonlocal uniformly elliptic operators with respect to $\mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)$ satisfying Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3. Suppose that the boundary value problem*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{I}_0 u - \partial_t u = 0 & \text{in } Q_1, \\ u = h & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1 \end{cases}$$

has at most one solution u for any $h \in \mathrm{C}(\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1)$ with

$$|h(x,t)| \le M(1 \vee (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\gamma}{\sigma}}).$$

Given a modulus of continuity ϱ and $\varepsilon > 0$, there are a small $\delta > 0$ and a large $R > 0$ so that if $u, v, \mathbf{I}_0, \mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ satisfy

$$\mathbf{I}_0 v - \partial_t v = 0,\ \mathbf{I}_1 u - \partial_t u \ge -\delta,\ \mathbf{I}_2 u - \partial_t u \le \delta,\ \|\mathbf{I}_1 - \mathbf{I}_0\| \vee \|\mathbf{I}_2 - \mathbf{I}_0\| \le \delta \text{ in } Q_1,$$

$$u = v \ \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1,$$

$$|u(x,t) - u(y,s)| \vee |v(x,t) - v(y,s)| \le \varrho((|x - y|^\sigma + |t - s|)^{1/\sigma})$$
$$\text{for any } x \in Q_R \setminus Q_1 \text{ and } y \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1,$$

$$|u(x,t)| \le M(1 \vee (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\gamma}{\sigma}}),$$

then we have that $|u - v| < \varepsilon$ in Q_1.

Proof. Assume that the result was not true. Then there would be sequences $\{R_k\}, \{\mathbf{I}_0^{(k)}\}$, $\{\mathbf{I}_1^{(k)}\}, \{\mathbf{I}_2^{(k)}\}$, $\{\eta_k\}, \{u_k\}, \{v_k\}, \{\mathbf{I}_k\}$ and $\{f_k\}$ such that $R_k \to \infty$, $\eta_k \to 0$ and all the assumptions of the lemma hold, but $\sup_{Q_1} |u_k - v_k| \geq \varepsilon$. Since $\{\mathbf{I}_0^{(k)}\}$ is a sequence of uniformly elliptic operators, it follows from Theorem 4.5 that there is a subsequence that converges weakly to some nonlocal operator $\mathbf{I}_0$ which is uniformly elliptic with respect to the same class $\mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)$. Moreover we see that $\{\mathbf{I}_1^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{I}_2^{(k)}\}$ converge to $\mathbf{I}_0$ weakly, because $\|\mathbf{I}_0^{(k)} - \mathbf{I}_1^{(k)}\| \to 0$ and $\|\mathbf{I}_0^{(k)} - \mathbf{I}_2^{(k)}\| \to 0$.

Since ϱ is a modulus of continuity on $\partial_p Q_1$ of both $\{u_k\}$ and $\{v_k\}$, by Theorem 3.3 there is a modulus of continuity $\tilde{\varrho}$ which extends to the full unit ball $\overline{Q}_1$. Thus $\{u_k\}$ and $\{v_k\}$ have a modulus of continuity on Q_{R_k} with $R_k \to \infty$. We can find subsequences $\{u_{k_j}\}$ and $\{v_{k_j}\}$ which converges uniformly on compact sets, thus converging to some function h almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^n_T$. Since $|u_{k_j}| \vee |v_{k_j}| \leq g$ for all j where $g(x,t) = M(1 \vee (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\gamma}{\sigma}})$, and $g \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$, it follows from the Lebesgue's dominated convergence theorem that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \|u_{k_j} - h\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{j\to\infty} \|v_{k_j} - h\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} = 0.$$

Let u and v be the uniform limits of $\{u_{k_j}\}$ and $\{v_{k_j}\}$ in Q_1, respectively. Since $\sup_{Q_1} |u_{k_j} - v_{k_j}| \geq \varepsilon$, u and v must be different. By Lemma 4.3, we see that u and v solve the same equation $\mathbf{I}_0 u - \partial_t u = \mathbf{I}_0 v - \partial_t v = 0$ in Q_1. Thus by the assumption, $u = v$ which is a contradiction. □

Remark. We will apply Lemma 4.6 to a translation-invariant operator $\mathbf{I}_0$. In case that $\mathbf{I}_0$ is a translation-invariant elliptic operator, the uniqueness for the viscosity solution of the boundary value problem was discussed in [CS2].

We also obtain the following simplified one of Lemma 4.6. The difference between this and Lemma 4.6 is that in Lemma 4.7 we fix the boundary value h, but we do not need a modulus of continuity in $Q_R \setminus Q_1$ and also on $\partial_p Q_1$.

Lemma 4.7. *For some $\sigma \geq \sigma_0 > 1$ and $\gamma \in (0, \sigma_0 - 1)$, let $\mathbf{I}_0, \mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ be nonlocal uniformly elliptic operators with respect to $\mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)$ satisfying Assumptions 2.2 and 2.3. Suppose that the boundary value problem*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{I}_0 u - \partial_t u = 0 & \text{in } Q_1, \\ u = h & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1 \end{cases}$$

has at most one solution u for some function h. Assume that h is continuous on $\partial_p Q_1$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is some small $\delta > 0$ (depending on h) so that if $u, v, \mathbf{I}_0, \mathbf{I}_1$ and $\mathbf{I}_2$ satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{I}_0 v - \partial_t v = 0,\ \mathbf{I}_1 u - \partial_t u \geq -\delta,\ \mathbf{I}_2 u - \partial_t u \leq \delta,\ \|\mathbf{I}_1 - \mathbf{I}_0\| \vee \|\mathbf{I}_2 - \mathbf{I}_0\| \leq \delta \ \text{ in } Q_1, \\ &\qquad u = v = h \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1, \end{aligned}$$

then we have that $|u - v| < \varepsilon$ in Q_1.

Proof. We proceed the proof along the same line as that of Lemma 4.6. After assuming that the result was not true, we complete it by arriving at a contradiction. Assume that there are sequences $\{\mathbf{I}_0^{(k)}\}, \{\mathbf{I}_1^{(k)}\}, \{\mathbf{I}_2^{(k)}\}$, $\{\eta_k\}, \{u_k\}, \{v_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{I}_k\}$ such that $\eta_k \to 0$ and all the assumptions of the lemma hold, but $\sup_{Q_1} |u_k - v_k| \geq \varepsilon$. The functions u_k and v_k have a fixed value h outside Q_1. Since h is continuous on $\partial_p Q_1$, by Theorem 3.3 we see that $\{u_k\}$ and $\{v_k\}$ are equicontinuous in $\overline{Q}_1$. So by Arzela-Ascoli Theorem, there is a subsequence which converges uniformly in $\overline{Q}_1$.

Continuing as in the proof of Lemma 4.6, we can take a subsequence such that $\{\mathbf{I}_1^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\mathbf{I}_0^{(k)}\}$ converges to $\mathbf{I}_0$ weakly. Let u and v be the uniform limits of u_k and v_k in Q_1, respectively. Then we have that $\sup_{Q_1}|u_k-v_k|\geq\varepsilon$. But by Lemma 4.3, u and v must solve the same equation $\mathbf{I}_0u-\partial_tu=\mathbf{I}_0v-\partial_tv=0$ in Q_1. Thus we conclude that $u=v$, which is a contradiction. □

5. $C^{1,\alpha}$-REGULARITY FOR NONLOCAL PARABOLIC EQUATIONS WITH VARIABLE COEFFICIENTS

The main concern of this section is to obtain $C^{1,\alpha}$ estimates for nonlocal parabolic equations which are not necessarily translation-invariant. Since our proofs rely on rescaling argument repeatedly, a kind of scale invariance will be needed. Even if we do not require a particular equation to be scale invariant, we will consider our equations within a whole class of equations that is scale invariant for which our regularity result up to the boundary is supposed to apply. Our proof on the parabolic case that will be given in this section is based on that [CS1] of the elliptic case and the results [KL] of the parabolic case, but the main difference between them is to extend the solution space $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ on the elliptic one to the more flexible space $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ on the parabolic one and to use the more wider class of kernels involving variables $(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T$.

The class $\mathfrak{L}$ is said to have *scale* σ if whenever the integro-differential operator with kernel $K(x,y,t)$ is in $\mathfrak{L}$, its rescaled kernel $K_\lambda(x,y,t):=\lambda^{n+\sigma}K(x,\lambda y,t)$ is also in $\mathfrak{L}$ for any $\lambda\in(0,1)$. For example, the class $\mathfrak{L}_0$ defined in (1.3) has scale σ, but the class $\mathfrak{L}_*$ defined in (2.5) does not.

It is easy to check that if $\mathfrak{L}$ has scale σ and u solves an equation $\mathbf{I}u(x,t)-\partial_tu(x,t)=f(x,t)$ in Q_3 that is elliptic with respect to $\mathfrak{L}$, then the function $w_\mu(x,t)=\mu\,u(\lambda x,\lambda^\sigma t)$ solves a uniformly elliptic equation

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mu,\lambda}w_\mu(x,t)-\partial_tw_\mu(x,t)=\lambda^\sigma\mu f(\lambda x,\lambda^\sigma t)\ \text{ in } Q_3 \tag{5.1}$$

with respect to the same class $\mathfrak{L}$. Equivalently, this condition becomes

$$\mathbf{I}_{1,\lambda}w_1(x,t)-\partial_tw_1(x,t)=\lambda^\sigma f(\lambda x,\lambda^\sigma t)\ \text{ in } Q_3; \tag{5.2}$$

that is, $\mathbf{I}_{1,\lambda}u-\partial_tu=\lambda^\sigma f$ in $Q_{3\lambda}$. For instance, if $\mathbf{I}u(x,t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu_t(x,y,t)K(x,y,t)\,dy$, then $\mathbf{I}_{\mu,\lambda}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{I}_{\mu,\lambda}u(x,t)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}[u(x+y,t)+u(x-y,t)-2u(x,t)]\lambda^{n+\sigma}K(x,\lambda y,t)\,dy.$$

Here note that *the coefficient* μ *does not have any effect on a linear operator.*

We will call $\mathfrak{L}_1$ the largest scale invariant class contained in the class $\mathfrak{L}_*$ satisfying (2.5). This is the class of integro-differential operators with kernels K satisfying (1.3) such that

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T}|\nabla_yK(x,y,t)|\leq\frac{C_1}{|y|^{n+\sigma+1}}\ \text{ for any } y\in\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Then it follows from Theorem 2.6 that an equation $\mathbf{I}_0u-\partial_tu=0$ has interior $C^{1,\beta}$-estimates for some $\beta>0$, provided that $\mathbf{I}_0$ is uniformly elliptic with respect to the class $\mathfrak{L}_1$.

Our main result in this section is to obtain that if an equation $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}u(x)-\partial_tu=0$ is uniformly elliptic with respect to a scale invariant class with interior $C^{1,\beta}$-estimates and we have another equation $\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u = f$ for a little perturbation $\mathbf{I}$ of $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}$, then this equation also has interior $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates for any $\alpha \in (0, \beta \wedge (\sigma - 1))$.

Definition 5.1. *For $\sigma \in (0,2)$ and an operator $\mathbf{I}$, we define the rescaled operator $\mathbf{I}_{\mu,\lambda}$ as in* (5.1). *Then the norm of scale σ is defined as*

$$\|\mathbf{I}^{(1)} - \mathbf{I}^{(2)}\|_\sigma = \sup_{(\mu,\lambda)\in[1,\infty)\times(0,1]} \|\mathbf{I}^{(1)}_{\mu,\lambda} - \mathbf{I}^{(2)}_{\mu,\lambda}\|$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm defined in Definition 2.1.

Remark 5.2. *From* (5.2)*, we see that* $\|\mathbf{I}^{(1)} - \mathbf{I}^{(2)}\|_\sigma = \sup_{\lambda\in(0,1]} \|\mathbf{I}^{(1)}_{1,\lambda} - \mathbf{I}^{(2)}_{1,\lambda}\|$

The rescaled operator implies that if u solves the equation $\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u = f$ in Q_λ, then the rescaled function $w_\mu(x,t) = \mu u(\lambda x, \lambda^\sigma t)$ solves an equation of the same ellipticity type $\mathbf{I}_{\mu,\lambda} w_\mu(x,t) - \partial_t w_\mu(x,t) = \lambda^\sigma \mu f(\lambda x, \lambda^\sigma t)$ in Q_1.

The following theorem is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\sigma \in (\sigma_0, 2)$ for $\sigma_0 \in (1,2)$ and let $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}$ be a fixed translation-invariant nonlocal operator in a class $\mathfrak{L} \subset \mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)$ with scale σ. Suppose that the equation $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}u - \partial_t u = 0$ in $Q_{1+\eta}$ has interior $C^{1,\beta}$-estimates. Let $\mathbf{I}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{I}^{(2)}$ be two nonlocal operators which are uniformly elliptic with respect to $\mathfrak{L}_0(\sigma)$ and assume that $\|\mathbf{I}^{(0)} - \mathbf{I}^{(k)}\|_\sigma < \delta$ for some $\delta > 0$ small enough and $k = 1, 2$. If $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ solves the equations*

$$\mathbf{I}^{(1)}u - \partial_t u \geq f_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{I}^{(2)}u - \partial_t u \leq f_2 \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta}$$

for functions $f_1, f_2 \in \mathrm{B}(Q_{1+\eta})$, then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, \beta \wedge (\sigma_0 - 1))$ and there is a constant $C > 0$ (depending only on $\sigma_0, \lambda, \Lambda, \eta$ and the dimension but not on σ) such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})} \leq C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_1|) \vee (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_2|)\big). \tag{5.4}$$

Proof. We note that u is continuous on $\overline{Q}_{1+\eta}$. We write $u = v + w$ where $v = u\mathbb{1}_{Q_{1+\eta}}$ and $w = u\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_{1+\eta}}$. Then we easily see that

$$\mathbf{I}^{(1)}v - \partial_t v \geq -\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} - (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_1|) \vee (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_2|)$$

in $Q_{1+\epsilon}$. Similarly, we have that

$$\mathbf{I}^{(2)}v - \partial_t v \leq \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_1|) \vee (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_2|)$$

in $Q_{1+\epsilon}$. So we might use v instead of u.

We now select some $\lambda > 0$ small enough so that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda^{\beta-\alpha} + C_0 2^{\frac{(1-\sigma)(\beta-\alpha_1)}{\sigma}} \lambda^{\alpha_1-\alpha} 2^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}} < 1, \\ &\lambda^{\beta-\alpha} + 2^{\frac{(\sigma-1)(1+\alpha_1)}{\sigma}} \lambda^{\alpha_1-\alpha}(3 + C_\beta + C_{\sigma,\beta}) < 1. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Take any $\varepsilon > 0$ with $\varepsilon < \lambda^{1+\beta}$. Then we choose $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ small enough as in Lemma 4.6. By scaling, without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_1|) \vee (\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f_2|) < \delta \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbb{R}^n} |u| \leq 1$$

and u solves the equation in some large cube Q_R.

By [C], it suffices to show that there are some $\lambda \in (0,1)$ and a sequence of linear functions

$$\ell_k(x,t) = a_k + \langle b_k, x\rangle + c_k\, t$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q_{\lambda^k}} |u - \ell_k| &\le \lambda^{k(1+\alpha)}, \\ |a_{k+1} - a_k| &\le \lambda^{k(1+\alpha)}, \\ \lambda^k |b_{k+1} - b_k| &\le c_2 \lambda^{k(1+\alpha)}, \\ \lambda^{k\sigma} |c_{k+1} - c_k| &\le c_3 \lambda^{k(1+\alpha)}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Set $\ell_0 = 0$. Then we note that $|u_0| \le 1$ in Q_1 and $|u_0(x,t)| \le (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}}$ for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$. We now continue the proof by the mathematical induction. Assume that (5.7) holds for k-step. We shall show that they are still working for $(k+1)$-step. We set

$$u_k(x,t) = \frac{u(\lambda^k x, \lambda^{k\sigma} t) - \ell_k(\lambda^k x, \lambda^{k\sigma} t)}{\lambda^{k(1+\alpha)}}.$$

Since the class $\mathfrak{L}$ has scale σ, u_k solves equations of the same ellipticity type as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{I}^{(1)}_k u_k(x,t) &:= \mathbf{I}^{(1)}_{\lambda^{-k(1+\alpha)},\lambda^k} u_k(x,t) \ge \lambda^{k(\sigma-1-\alpha)} f_1(\lambda^k x, \lambda^{k\sigma} t), \\ \mathbf{I}^{(2)}_k u_k(x,t) &:= \mathbf{I}^{(2)}_{\lambda^{-k(1+\alpha)},\lambda^k} u_k(x,t) \le \lambda^{k(\sigma-1-\alpha)} f_2(\lambda^k x, \lambda^{k\sigma} t). \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

We observe that the right hand side (5.8) is getting smaller as k increases. Thus we have that

$$\|\mathbf{I}^{(i)}_k - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}_k\| \le \|\mathbf{I}^{(i)} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}\|_\sigma < \delta.$$

Let $\alpha_1 \in (\alpha, \beta \wedge (\sigma_0 - 1))$ be given. By the inductive assumption, we see that $|u_k| \le 1$ in Q_1 and $|u_k(x,t)| \le (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}}$ for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$. Then we shall construct functions $\ell_{k+1}(x,t)$ and $u_{k+1}(x,t)$ so that

$$|u_{k+1}(x,t)| \le (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}} \quad \text{for any } (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1.$$

Since u is uniformly continuous on $\overline{Q}_{1+\eta}$, we may take some $R = R(\varepsilon) > 0$ (as in Lemma 4.6) so that u admits a modulus of continuity ϱ satisfying

$$|u(x,t) - u(y,s)| \le \varrho((|x-y|^\sigma + |t-s|)^{1/\sigma})$$

for any $(x,t) \in (Q_R \setminus Q_1)$ and $(y,s) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$. Then we apply Lemma 4.6 to the function g which solves

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{I}^{(0)}_k g - \partial_t g = 0 & \text{in } Q_1, \\ g = u_k & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1 \end{cases}$$

to obtain that $\sup_{Q_1} |u_k - g| < \varepsilon$. By the assumption, we note that $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}_k$ has interior $C^{1,\beta}$-estimates. Let $\hat{g}(x,t) = \hat{a} + \langle \hat{b}, x\rangle + \hat{c}\, t$ be the linear part of g at the origin. Then we see that $|\hat{a}| < 1 + \varepsilon$, because $\sup_{Q_1} |g| \le 1 + \varepsilon$. By the $C^{1,\beta}$-estimates of g, we have that

$$|g(x,t) - \hat{g}(x,t)| \le C_0 (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\beta}{\sigma}} \tag{5.8}$$

for any $(x,t) \in Q_{1/2}$. Since $\hat{g}\big(\frac{\hat{b}}{2|\hat{b}|}, 0\big) = \hat{a} + \frac{1}{2}|\hat{b}|$, by (5.9) we have the upper bound of $\hat{b}$ as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{b}| &\le 2\big|\hat{g}\big(\frac{\hat{b}}{2|\hat{b}|}, 0\big) - g\big(\frac{\hat{b}}{2|\hat{b}|}, 0\big)\big| + 2\big|g\big(\frac{\hat{b}}{2|\hat{b}|}, 0\big)\big| + 2|\hat{a}| \\ &= C_0 2^{-\beta} + 4(1+\varepsilon) := C_\beta. \end{aligned}$$

From the fact that $\hat{g}(0, -4^{-\sigma}) = \hat{a} - 4^{-\sigma}\hat{c}$, by applying (5.9) again we obtain that $|\hat{c}| \le 4^{\sigma}(4^{-(1+\beta)} + 2(1+\varepsilon)) := C_{\sigma,\beta}$. Then we can derive the estimates as follows;

(5.9)

$$|u_k(x,t) - \hat{g}(x,t)| \le \begin{cases} \varepsilon + C_0(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\beta}{\sigma}}, & (x,t) \in Q_{1/2}, \\ \varepsilon + 2 + C_\beta + C_{\sigma,\beta}, & (x,t) \in Q_1 \setminus Q_{1/2}, \\ \varepsilon + (2 + C_\beta + C_{\sigma,\beta})(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}}, & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1. \end{cases}$$

We now set

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_{k+1}(x,t) &= \ell_k(x,t) + \lambda^{k(1+\alpha)}\hat{g}(\lambda^{-k}x, \lambda^{-k\sigma}t), \\ u_{k+1}(x,t) &:= \frac{u(\lambda^{k+1}x, \lambda^{(k+1)\sigma}t) - \ell_{k+1}(\lambda^{k+1}x, \lambda^{(k+1)\sigma}t)}{\lambda^{(k+1)(1+\alpha)}} \\ &= \frac{u_k(\lambda x, \lambda^\sigma t) - \hat{g}(\lambda x, \lambda^\sigma t)}{\lambda^{1+\alpha}}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Then it follows from (5.6) and (5.10) that

(5.11)

$$\begin{aligned} &|u_{k+1}(x,t)| \\ &\le \begin{cases} \lambda^{\beta-\alpha} + C_0 2^{\frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma}(\beta-\alpha_1)}\lambda^{\alpha_1-\alpha}(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}}, & (x,t) \in Q_{\lambda^{-1}/2}, \\ 2^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}(1+\alpha_1)}\lambda^{\alpha_1-\alpha}(3 + C_\beta + C_{\sigma,\beta})(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}}, & (x,t) \in Q_{\lambda^{-1}} \setminus Q_{\lambda^{-1}/2}, \\ \lambda^{\beta-\alpha} + \lambda^{\alpha_1-\alpha}(2 + C_\beta + C_{\sigma,\beta})(|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}}, & (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_{\lambda^{-1}}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and moreover $|u_{k+1}| \le 1$ on Q_1 and $|u_{k+1}(x,t)| \le (|x|^\sigma + |t|)^{\frac{1+\alpha_1}{\sigma}}$ for any $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_1$. Also, we obtain (5.7) from (5.11). Finally, it follows from (5.11) that

$$u(x,t) - \ell_{k+1}(x,t) = \lambda^{(k+1)(1+\alpha)}u_{k+1}(\lambda^{-(k+1)}x, \lambda^{-(k+1)\sigma}t)$$

for any $(x,t) \in Q_{\lambda^{k+1}}$, and thus we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{Q_{\lambda^{k+1}}} |u - \ell_{k+1}| &\le \lambda^{(k+1)(1+\alpha)} \sup_{Q_1} |u_{k+1}| \\ &\le \lambda^{(k+1)(1+\alpha)}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we complete the proof. □

6. Cordes-Nirenberg type estimates and Applications

We furnish various concrete applications of the previous results in this section. Our proofs on the parabolic case are based on that [CS1] of the elliptic case and the results [KL] of the parabolic case, but the main difference between them is in that we extend the solution space $\mathrm{B}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ on the elliptic one to the more flexible space $L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ on the parabolic one and use the more wider class of kernels involving variables $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T$.

6.1. a parabolic version of the integral Cordes-Nirenberg type estimates

When the equation is linear and close to an operator in $\mathfrak{L}_1$ in an appropriate way, we shall obtain the regularity results of its viscosity solutions. This is a parabolic version of the integral Cordes-Nirenberg type estimates.

Theorem 6.1. *For $\sigma \in (0,2)$, let $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ be a viscosity solution of the equation*

$$\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u := \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu_{\cdot}(u,\cdot,y)\frac{(2-\sigma)c(\,\cdot\,,y,\,\cdot\,)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy - \partial_t u = f \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta},$$

where $f \in \mathrm{B}(Q_{1+\eta})$. Suppose that there is some $\delta > 0$ small enough such that

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n}\,\sup_{(x,t)\in Q_3} |c(x,y,t) - c_0(x,y,t)| < \delta, \tag{6.1}$$

where c_0 is a bounded function so that $(2-\sigma)c_0(x,y,t)/|y|^{n+\sigma}$ satisfies (5.3) *and* (5.4). *If $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ is a viscosity solution of the equation*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu_{\cdot}(u,\cdot,y)\frac{(2-\sigma)c_0(\,\cdot\,,y,\,\cdot\,)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy - \partial_t u = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta},$$

then there is some $\beta \in (0,1)$ so that $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})$ for any $\alpha \in (0, \beta \wedge (\sigma-1))$ and there is a constant $C > 0$ (depending only on $\sigma_0, \lambda, \Lambda, \eta$ and the dimension but not on σ) such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})} \le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|f|\big).$$

Proof. We apply Theorem 5.3. In this case, $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}$ is given by

$$\mathbf{I}^{(0)}u(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu_t(u,x,y)\frac{(2-\sigma)c_0(x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy.$$

By the assumption, the operator $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}$ is translation-invariant and belongs to $\mathfrak{L}_1$, which is a scale invariant class. By Theorem 2.6, the viscosity solution $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ of $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}u - \partial_t u = 0$ in $Q_{1+\eta}$ has interior $C^{1,\beta}$-estimates for some $\beta \in (0,1)$. In this case, it is easy to see that since the equation is linear and the coefficients do not depend on (x,t), the derivatives of the solution u of the equation solve the same equation, so that the solutions are actually $C^{2,\beta}$. So, moreover, the solutions u of $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}u - \partial_t u = 0$ has interior $C^{1,1}$-estimates.

Now we estimate $\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}\|_\sigma := \sup_{\lambda\in(0,1)} \|\mathbf{I}_{1,\lambda} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}_{1,\lambda}\|$. We take any $\lambda \in (0,1]$ and set $w_1 = u(\lambda\,\cdot, \lambda^\sigma\cdot)$ in $Q_{1+\eta}$. Take any $(x,t) \in Q_{(1+\eta)\lambda}$. Then we compute

$$(\mathbf{I}_{1,\lambda} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}_{1,\lambda})u(x,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu_t(u,x,y)\frac{(2-\sigma)\big(c(x,\lambda y,t) - c_0(x,\lambda y,t)\big)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy$$

by applying (6.1). By Definition 2.1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{I}_{1,\lambda} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}_{1,\lambda}\| &= \sup_{((x,t),u)\in\mathcal{F}^\epsilon_{Q_{(1+\eta)\lambda}}} \frac{|\mathbf{I}_{1,\lambda}u(x,t) - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}_{1,\lambda}u(x,t)|}{1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q_\epsilon(x,t))}} \\ &\le \sup_{((x,t),u)\in\mathcal{F}^\epsilon_{Q_{(1+\eta)\lambda}}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\mu_t(u,x,y)|\frac{(2-\sigma)\,\delta}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy}{1 + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q_\epsilon(x,t))}} \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

In Definition 2.1, we take functions u such that $\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q_\epsilon(x,t))} < \infty$. Set $u = v + w$ where $v = u\mathbb{1}_{Q_{1+\eta}}$ and $w = u\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R}^n_T \setminus Q_{1+\eta}}$. Since $-x \pm y \in B_\epsilon$ if $x \mp y \in B_\epsilon$, we see that $\pm y \in B_\epsilon(x)$. So we have that $\mu_t(v,x,y) = \mu_t(u,x,y)$ for $y \in B_\epsilon(x)$ and $\mu_t(v,x,y) = 0$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_\epsilon(x)$. Since $B_\epsilon(x) \subset B_{1+\eta}$ for any $x \in B_{1+\epsilon}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\mu_t(v,x,y)| \frac{2-\sigma}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy &= \int_{B_\epsilon(x)} |\mu_t(u,x,y)| \frac{2-\sigma}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy \\ &\le \int_{B_{1+\eta}} \|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q_\epsilon(x,t))} |y|^2 \frac{2-\sigma}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy \le C\|u\|_{C^{1,1}(Q_\epsilon(x,t))}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $w(x,t) = 0$ and $|x \pm y| \ge |y| - |x| \ge \frac{\eta}{2(1+\eta)}|y|$ for $x \in B_{1+\epsilon}$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus B_{1+\eta}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^n} |\mu_t(w,x,y)| \frac{2-\sigma}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy &\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \bigl(|w(x+y,t)| + |w(x-y,t)|\bigr) \frac{2-\sigma}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy \\ &= \int_{|y|\ge 1+\eta} |u(y,t)| \Bigl(\frac{2-\sigma}{|x+y|^{n+\sigma}} + \frac{2-\sigma}{|x-y|^{n+\sigma}} \Bigr)\,dy \\ &\le C \int_{|y|\ge 1+\eta} |u(y,t)| \frac{2-\sigma}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy \le C\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

By (6.2), we conclude that $\|\mathbf{I}_{1,\lambda} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}_{1,\lambda}\| \le C\delta$ for any $\lambda \in (0,1)$, and thus we have that $\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}\|_\sigma \le C\delta$. If we choose η small enough, we can apply Theorem 5.3 and conclude that the equation $\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u = f$ has interior $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates for any $\alpha \in (0, \beta \wedge (\sigma - 1))$. □

6.2. Nonlinear equations

From Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 2.6, we can easily derive the following result.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $\sigma \in [\sigma_0, 2)$ for $\sigma_0 \in (1,2)$ and let $\mathfrak{L}_1(\sigma)$ be the class satisfying* (5.3) *and* (5.4). *Suppose that $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ is a viscosity solution of the equation*

$$\mathbf{I}^{(0)}u - \partial_t u = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta}$$

and $\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{I}^{(0)}\|_\sigma < \delta$ for some small $\delta > 0$, where $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}$ is a translation-invariant nonlocal operator which is uniformly elliptic with respect to $\mathfrak{L}_1(\sigma)$ and $\mathbf{I}$ is an operator which is uniformly elliptic with respect to $\mathfrak{L}_0$. If $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ is a viscosity solution of the equation

$$\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u = f \quad \text{in } Q_{1+\eta}$$

where $f \in \mathrm{B}(Q_{1+\eta})$, then $u \in C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})$ for some small $\alpha > 0$ and there is a constant $C > 0$ (depending only on $\sigma_0, \lambda, \Lambda, \eta, C_1$ and the dimension, but not on σ) such that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})} \le C\bigl(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f| \bigr).$$

Remark 6.3. *We consider the following operator $\mathbf{I}$ given by*

$$\mathbf{I}u := \inf_\alpha \sup_\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu.(u,\cdot,y) \frac{(2-\sigma)\bigl(c_0(\,\cdot\,,y,\,\cdot\,) + c_{\alpha\beta}(\,\cdot\,,y,\,\cdot\,)\bigr)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy$$

where c_0 *and* $c_{\alpha\beta}$ *are functions satisfying*

$$\lambda \leq c_0(x,y,t) \leq \Lambda,\ |\nabla_y c_0(x,y,t)| \leq \frac{C}{|y|} \ \textit{ for any } y \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\} \textit{ and } (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^n_T,$$

$$\sup_{\alpha,\beta} \sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T} |c_{\alpha\beta}(x,y,t)| < \delta \quad \textit{for some small } \delta > 0.$$

Then we see that this is a nonlinear operator which exemplifies Theorem 6.2.

Theorem 6.4. *Let* $\sigma \in [\sigma_0, 2)$ *for* $\sigma_0 \in (1,2)$ *and let* $\mathbf{I}u$ *be given by*

$$\mathbf{I}u = \inf_\alpha \sup_\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu_{\cdot}(u,\cdot,y) \frac{(2-\sigma)c_{\alpha\beta}(\,\cdot\,,y,\,\cdot\,)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy$$

where $\lambda < c_{\alpha\beta}(x,y,t) < \Lambda$, $|\nabla_y c_{\alpha\beta}(x,y,t)| \leq C_2/|y|$ *and*

$$\sup_{\alpha,\beta} |c_{\alpha\beta}(x_1,y,t_1) - c_{\alpha\beta}(x_2,y,t_2)| = o(1) \ \textit{ as } \mathrm{d}((x_1,t_1),(x_2,t_2)) \to 0$$

with the parabolic distance d*. If* $u \in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ *is a viscosity solution of the equation*

$$\mathbf{I}u - \partial_t u = f \ \textit{ in } Q_{1+\eta}$$

where $f \in \mathrm{B}(Q_{1+\eta})$, *then there are a small* $\alpha > 0$ *and a constant* $C > 0$ (*depending only on* $\sigma_0, \lambda, \Lambda, \eta, C_2$, *the modulus of continuity* ϱ *and the dimension, but not on* σ) *such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})} \leq C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f|\big).$$

Proof. For each $(x_0,t_0) \in Q_{1+\epsilon}$, we can find a ball $Q_r(x_0,t_0) \subset Q_{1+\eta}$ ($r > 0$ is independent of x_0 and t_0) so that

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in Q_r(x_0,t_0)} |c_{\alpha\beta}(x,y,t) - c_{\alpha\beta}(x_0,y,t_0)| < \delta$$

for some small $\delta > 0$. This implies that $\|\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{I}_{(x_0,t_0)}\|_\sigma < C\delta$ on $Q_r(x_0,t_0)$ as in the proof of Theorem 6.2, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{I}_{(x_0,t_0)}u(x,t) &:= \inf_\alpha \sup_\beta \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mu_t(u,x,y) \frac{(2-\sigma)c_{\alpha\beta}(x_0,y,t_0)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}\,dy \\ &= \mathbf{I}(\tau_{(x-x_0,t-t_0)}u)(x_0,t_0).\end{aligned}$$

We now apply Theorem 6.2 with $\mathbf{I}^{(0)} = \mathbf{I}_{(x_0,t_0)}$ scaled in $Q_r(x_0,t_0)$. Let N be the minimal number of such open balls $Q_r(x_0,t_0)$ covering $\overline{Q}_{1+\epsilon}$. Then we have that

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})} \leq C_N\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |u| + \|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)} + \sup_{Q_{1+\eta}} |f|\big).$$

Hence we complete the proof. □

6.3. Nonlinear equations with non-differentiable kernels

We note that Theorem 5.3 makes it possible to obtain certain results even in the translation-invariant case. It was crucial in Theorem 2.6 that every kernel must be differentiable away from the origin. This condition can be weakened in the following way. We establish $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates for nonlocal equations that are uniformly elliptic with respect to the class $\mathfrak{L}$ consisting of operators with kernels $K \in \mathcal{K}$ given by

$$K(x,y,t) = (2-\sigma)\frac{c_1(x,y,t) + c_2(x,y,t)}{|y|^{n+\sigma}}$$

where $\lambda \le c_1 \le \Lambda$,

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^n}\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T}|c_2(x,y,t)|<\delta,\ \sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^n_T}|\nabla_y c_1(x,y,t)|\le\frac{C_2}{|y|}\ \text{ for any } y\in\mathbb{R}^n\setminus\{0\}.$$

Theorem 6.5. *Let* $\sigma\in[\sigma_0,2)$ *for* $\sigma_0\in(1,2)$ *and let* $\delta>0$ *be a small enough number (depending only on* λ,Λ,C_2 *and the dimension, but not on* σ*) as in the above. If* $u\in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ *solves the nonlocal equation*

$$\mathbf{I}u-\partial_t u:=\inf_\alpha\sup_\beta\int_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mu.(u,\cdot,y)K_{\alpha\beta}(y,\cdot)\,dy-\partial_t u=f\ \text{ in } Q_{1+\eta}$$

for $f\in\mathrm{B}(Q_{1+\eta})$ *and* $\{K_{\alpha\beta}\}\subset\mathcal{K}$*, then there are some* $\alpha>0$ *and* $C>0$ *(depending only on* $\sigma_0,\lambda,\Lambda,\eta$ *and the dimension but not on* σ*) such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})}\le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|u|+\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}+\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|f|\big).$$

Proof. Let $L\in\mathfrak{L}$ be an operator with kernel K. We write $K=K_1+K_2$ where $K_1=(2-\sigma)c_1(x,y,t)/|y|^{n+\sigma}$ and set $L=L^1+L^2$ where L^1 and L^2 are operators with kernels K_1 and K_2, respectively. Then we see that $\|L-L^1\|_\sigma<c\delta$. If we set $\mathbf{I}^{(0)}u=\inf_\alpha\sup_\beta L^1_{\alpha\beta}u$, then we have that $\|\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{I}^{(0)}\|_\sigma<c\delta$, and hence we can apply Theorem 5.3 to complete the proof. □

Remark. This theorem works for a class which is still much smaller than $\mathfrak{L}_0$. It would be very interesting to determine whether the class $\mathfrak{L}_0$ has interior $C^{1,\alpha}$-estimates or not. This problem is still left open even for elliptic cases as mentioned in [CS1]. Also it would be interesting to answer this problem on the parabolic case.

6.4. Nonlinear equations near the fractional Laplacian

We obtain another result in translation-invariant case by applying Theorem 5.3. In fact, we obtain $C^{2,\alpha}$-estimates for nonlinear translation-invariant nonlocal parabolic equations which are sufficiently close to the parabolic fractional Laplacian and their ellipticity constants are sufficiently close to each other. This is to improve Theorem 2.6 under these conditions.

Theorem 6.6. *Let* $\sigma\in[\sigma_0,2)$ *for* $\sigma_0\in(1,2)$*. Then there are some* $\delta>0$ *and* $\rho_0>0$ *so that if* $-\delta<\lambda-1<\Lambda-1<\delta$, $\mathbf{I}$ *is a nonlocal translation-invariant uniformly elliptic operator with respect to* $\mathfrak{L}_*$ *and* $u\in L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)$ *satisfies* $\mathbf{I}u-\partial_t u=0$ *in* $Q_{1+\eta}$*, then* $u\in C^{2,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})$ *for a constant* $\alpha>0$ *(depending only on* n *and* σ_0*) and there is a universal constant* $C>0$ *(depending only on* σ_0,n,η *and the constant in* (2.5)*) such that*

$$\|u\|_{C^{2,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})}\le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|u|+\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}+|\mathbf{I}0|\big)$$

where we denote by $\mathbf{I}0$ *the value we obtain when we apply* $\mathbf{I}$ *to the constant function that is equal to zero.*

Proof. From Theorem 2.6, we see that $u\in C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})$. Thus the function u is differentiable in x on $Q_{1+\epsilon}$. Let $w=e\cdot\nabla_x u$ be a directional derivative for $e\in S^{n-1}$. We write $w=w_1+w_2$ where $w_1=w\mathbb{1}_{Q_{1+\eta}}$. Then by using the uniform ellipticity with respect to $\mathfrak{L}_*$ we easily see that w_1 solves

$$\mathbf{M}^+_{\mathfrak{L}_*}w_1-\partial_t w_1\ge-\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}-|\mathbf{I}0|,\ \mathbf{M}^-_{\mathfrak{L}_*}w_1-\partial_t w_1\le\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}+|\mathbf{I}0|\text{ in } Q_{1+2\eta/3}.$$

We now apply Theorem 5.3 instead of Theorem 2.6. Since $1-\delta<\lambda<\Lambda<1+\delta$, as in (6.2) we easily obtain that

$$\|\mathbf{M}^{+}_{\mathfrak{L}_*}+(-\Delta)^{\sigma/2}\|_{\sigma}<c\delta\ \text{ and }\ \|\mathbf{M}^{-}_{\mathfrak{L}_*}+(-\Delta)^{\sigma/2}\|_{\sigma}<c\delta.$$

Thus Theorem 5.3 tells us that $w=e\cdot\nabla_x u$ is in $C^{1,\alpha}$ in $Q_{1+\epsilon}$ in the x-direction. From (2.6) and the local equivalence between $W^{1,\infty}$ and Lipschitz continuity, we see that $\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|\nabla_x u|\le\|u\|_{C^{0,1}_x(Q_{1+\eta})}\le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|u|+\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}\big)$. Also by (2.7) and integration by parts, we have that $\|\nabla_x u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}\le C\,\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}$. Moreover, if we take $e=\nabla_x u/|\nabla_x u|$ in the above, then we have that

$$\|\nabla_x u\|_{C^{1,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})}\le C\big(\sup_{Q_{1+\eta}}|u|+\|u\|_{L^\infty_T(L^1_\omega)}+|\mathbf{I}0|\big).$$

As in the proof of Theorem 2.6, we proceed $C^{2,\alpha}$-regularity in the t-direction. Since $(2+\alpha)/\sigma>1$ for such $\alpha>0$, we see that

$$\frac{2+\alpha-\sigma}{\sigma}+1=\frac{2+\alpha}{\sigma}$$

and $0<\alpha<2+\alpha-\sigma<1$. By the standard telescopic sum argument argument [CC], we can obtain that u is $\frac{2+\alpha-\sigma}{\sigma}$-Hölder continuous in the t-direction. we consider the difference quotients in the t-direction

$$w^\tau(x,t)=\frac{u(x,t+\tau)-u(x,t)}{|\tau|}.$$

Then by Theorem 2.0.4 [KL] we have that

$$\mathbf{M}^{+}_{\mathfrak{L}_*}w^\tau-\partial_t w^\tau\ge 0\ \text{ and }\ \mathbf{M}^{-}_{\mathfrak{L}_*}w^\tau-\partial_t w^\tau\le 0\ \text{ in } Q_{1+2\eta/3}.$$

So we can now apply Hölder regularity(Theorem 2.5) to w^τ. By applying the idea of the proof of Theorem 2.6, the $C^{1,\frac{2+\alpha-\sigma}{\sigma}}$-regularity of u in the t-direction can be achieved. This implies that $u\in C^{2,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})$ in the t-direction. Therefore we conclude that $u\in C^{2,\alpha}(Q_{1+\epsilon})$. □

References

[BL] Richard F. Bass and David A. Levin, *Harnack inequalities for jump processes,* Potential Anal. **17**(4), 2002, 375–388.

[C] Luis A. Caffarelli, *Interior a priori estimates for solutions of fully nonlinear equations,* Ann. of Math. (2) **130**(1), 1989, 189–213.

[CS1] Luis A. Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre, *Regularity results for nonlocal equations by approximation,* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **200**, 2011, 59–88.

[CS2] Luis A. Caffarelli and Luis Silvestre, *Regularity theory for fully nonlinear integro-differential equations,* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **62**(5), 2009, 597–638.

[CC] Luis A. Caffarelli and Xavier Cabré, *Fully nonlinear elliptic equations,* volume 43 of American Mathematical Society, Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.

[CW] Luis A. Caffarelli and Lihe Wang, *A Harnack Inequality Approach to the Interior Regularity of Parabolic Equations* Indiana Univ. Math. J. vol 42, no. 149, 1993, 159-165.
vol **95**, American Mathematical Society,

[GT] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order, Second edition.* Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 224. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. xiii+513 pp.

[GD] E. De Giorgi and G. Dal Maso, *Γ-convergence and calculus of variations,* Lecture notes in Mathematics **979**, 1983, Springer-Verlag.

[KL] Yong-Cheol Kim and Ki-Ahm Lee, *Regularity results for fully nonlinear parabolic integro-differential operators,* submitted (arXiv:1109.3807).

[KS] N. V. Krylov and M. V. Safonov, *An estimate for the probability of a diffusion process hitting a set of positive measure,* Dokl. Akad. Nauk. SSSR **245**, 1979, 18–20.

[S] Luis Silvestre, *Hölder estimates for solutions of integro-differential equations like the fractional laplace,* Indiana Univ. Math. Jour. **55**(3), 2006, 1155–1174.

• Yong-Cheol Kim : Department of Mathematics Education, Korea University, Seoul 136-701, Korea

E-mail address: `ychkim@korea.ac.kr`

• Ki-Ahm Lee : Department of Mathematics, Seoul National University, Seoul 151-747, Korea

E-mail address: `kiahm@math.snu.ac.kr`